CAMCIG Conference Call
Minutes
April 2, 2012, 1:30-3:00 pm

Present: Armanda Barone (UCB), Xiaoli Li (UCD), Wanda Jazayeri (UCI, Chair), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Heidi Hutchinson (UCR), Adolfo Tarango (UCSD/SCP), Bea Mallek (UCSF), Anna DeVore (UCSB, recorder), Yi-Yen Hayford (UCSC), Laura Krier (CDL).

1. Announcements

- San Diego is moving forward on its reorganization and has posted for internal recruitment five "project director" (~department head) positions for Academic Liaison Services, Digital User Services Program, Learning Services, Learning Spaces, and Research Data Curation Services.
- Irvine cleared out ~120K volumes of print serials that duplicated e-serials in the space of a month; faculty were consulted first; Wanda will send out the collections criteria used for the de-duping. (Bea pointed out that one can check risk categories on the WEST site.)
- Berkeley is continuing with its re-envisioning process; reports and recommendations are due in mid-April; to be discussed with the campus, April to June; put together/implemented(?) in July.
- Santa Cruz in re-dedicating its library on April 27; it will be a day of celebration with special tours and demonstrations. Student visits to the library have doubled. Candidates for its Assistant/Associate University Librarian Collections and Library Information Systems will be interviewing in the next couple weeks.
- Santa Barbara: the new Head of CMS, Michael Kim, started today.

2. Melvyl updates (standing topic)

Nothing new to report.

3. SCP updates (standing topic-Adolfo)

UNICODE updates are still on hold pending responses from III.

4. Updates on Pots and Lighting Teams participation (standing topic)

- POT 2.1.2, physical processing: report almost done and ready for POT meeting on April 9 (Wanda and Yi-Yen).
- POT 4: looking at report on recharge process (Adolfo).
- POT 5: LT1 and 1a reports in and are being discussed; they are being consolidated into one document for recommendations; all documents are on the wiki (Armanda and Adolfo)—CAMCIG participants support strong emphasis on the **very** low cost of the current SCP distribution process; if anything our reports

underestimated the efficiency of the current process, which is "mature, but not stagnant." The current incarnation of Melvyl is unsuitable for our record distribution. (Wanda et al.)
- POT 6: LT1.a finished report in early March (Xiaoli)
- POT 7: 4 LTs getting ready to go (Jim)

5. HathiTrust holdings data. **Review answers to questions from Hathi (Wanda forwarded emails on 3/21 regarding Hathi updating mechanism and on 3/28 with the answers to the outstanding questions.)**

Note: We discussed the issue of withdrawals throughout this item, so in these notes it has its own paragraph.]

Question 1: Meaning of "item." For serials, just the title level.

Questions 2 & 3: It appears that the absence of internal system numbers in files sent to Hathi is not an issue as long as the ID numbers within a campus file remain internally consistent—they could be OCLC numbers, system numbers, or item numbers. CAMCIG concern: system and OCLC numbers do not remain constant—records can be merged, new OCLC numbers applied; systems could be migrated and new system numbers used.

Question 4: Hathi will take test files. CAMCIG point: the test file will test format, but not scope.

Questions 5 & 6: Hathi wants holdings for RLFs and for SPiP (shared print in place) counted where they are "physically housed." Campuses generally display materials they have sent to the RLFs and shared print to which they have access as their current holdings. There are various scenarios for shared materials. How to report is up to the institution, especially on so short a timeframe. We still haven't received answers as to campus access to materials deposited in the RLFs. Do we report materials sent to the RLFs as "withdrawn"? It could give us potential access later; however, it is another layer of reporting and campuses don't consider them withdrawn.

Action: need to ask HOTS whether our interpretation on this question is correct; HOTS talks next week and Jim will bring it up.

Withdrawals: Some campuses have retrospective data; some can track prospectively. CAMCIG concerns: Keeping withdrawals in a local system forever is a problem. Campuses will need to discuss implications of keeping records for withdrawn items forever. Maintaining records for withdrawals is of dubious benefit to the campuses and hard to justify. Send snapshot every year, overlaying the previous year's holdings, and place onus on HT to figure out how to track withdrawals? How will Hathi react to the snapshot approach?

Action for the whole item: Wanda will write up the report. HOTS will weigh in. Next steps??

6. SPIP discussion—email from John Riemer and HOTS (forwarded by Wanda to CAMCIG on 3/14)

Question for HOTS: may we ignore the attachments to the email, some of which are out of date, and just look at the questions in the email (on the roles of the 793 and 583 fields)? What about numbered monographic series that could be classed together or separately? Need to follow standards on use of the 583 field. If we put local data into 793s in OCLC we want other campuses to be able to search it, but presently it is not possible.

What is CAMCIG charged with doing? Are we to do it with ACIG?

Action [copying from Wanda's updated timeline]:

* Sarah will take first stab at drafting questions and send to Xiaoli and Adolfo for comments & suggestions.
* Sarah, Adolfo and Xiaoli will send questions to CAMCIG members by April 11 (sooner if ready earlier) for comment
* CAMCIG members have April 11-13 to comment
* CAMCIG members send responses to Wanda for compilation (or one of you if you wish) by Monday April 23. Wanda will compile and send to CAMCIG for review on 4/25.
* CAMCIG have 4/26-4/27 to review compilation and make any comments
* Wanda will send to HOTS/John on 4/30

7. Other: no additional items.